



## CBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

20220202\_Parliament Hill protest costing Ottawa \$1M per day

Broadcast: MEDIA ANALYSIS REPORT | Analyzed: 2026-05-06 07:47

Version 2.0-cbc | Konverter 3.3 (2026-05-14) | Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 3(1)(l)

### OVERALL SCORE

**6.4/10**

*Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic survey of 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale from 0 (far left) to 10 (far right).

Party	NDP	GPC	LPC	BQ	CPC	PPC
CHES	2.0	2.5	4.5	5.0	7.5	9.0
Spectrum	Left	Left	Center	Center	Right	Right

The overall tendency is presented on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-favoring, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-favoring). The calculation is based on the difference in average favoritism of left vs. right parties (grouping per CHES 2024).

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**3.8 / 10**

*Left-favoring*

0 1 2 **3** 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — [chesdata.eu](https://chesdata.eu) | [Jolly et al., Electoral Studies, 2022](#) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](#)

This section provides political context and does not contribute to the overall score.

## BROADCAST INFO AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Identification

- Broadcast title: The National — CBC Television
- Estimated date: February 2, 2022 (per filename: 20220202)
- Approximate length: ~2–3 minutes (short news package)
- Anchor/Presenter: Not individually identified in transcript; standard anchor introduction implied

**President:** Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:kontakt@SVFAB.ch) - **Address:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zurich 1



**Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung**  
**Association suisse pour une information équilibrée**  
**Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato**

- Reporter: Ashley Burke, CBC News Ottawa (sign-off confirmed)
- Guests / Interviewees identified:
- Ottawa resident (unnamed): Describes racial slurs and being called "traitors" by protesters
- Ottawa city official or politician (unnamed): Calls for GoFundMe accountability; advocates suing GoFundMe
- Protester/demonstrator (unnamed): Defends use of funds; states police directed parking locations
- Financial/ethics commentator (unnamed): Notes GoFundMe's transaction-based revenue model

### **Main Topic**

---

The segment reports on the financial and social costs of the ongoing Freedom Convoy protest in Ottawa, focusing on the city's \$1M/day expenditure, the protesters' GoFundMe fundraising campaign, and the ethical questions surrounding that fundraising.

### **Current Context (as of February 2022)**

---

The Freedom Convoy protest began in late January 2022 as a truckers' movement opposing federal COVID-19 vaccine mandates for cross-border truckers, rapidly expanding into a broader anti-mandate and anti-government demonstration that occupied downtown Ottawa for weeks. The protest became one of the most politically divisive events in recent Canadian history, drawing support from conservative and libertarian constituencies while generating intense opposition from Ottawa residents, public health advocates, and federal and municipal governments. The GoFundMe campaign raised nearly \$10 million before GoFundMe froze and ultimately refunded the funds in early February 2022, citing violations of its terms of service — a decision itself contested by protesters and some civil liberties advocates. The protest eventually prompted the federal government to invoke the Emergencies Act for the first time in Canadian history on February 14, 2022, underscoring the extraordinary political stakes of the events being reported.



## CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Who is chosen to provide authoritative commentary, and whether their selection reflects independence, credibility, and diversity of expertise.

#### Finding 1:

- Location: Mid-segment
- Quote: "My Hope Is that GoFundMe understands that this is a completely inappropriate use of dollars"
- Technique: Advocacy voice presented as authoritative
- Problem: This speaker (likely a city official or politician) is given an authoritative platform to characterize the fundraising as "completely inappropriate" without any counter-expert challenging that characterization. No independent legal or financial expert is offered to assess whether the fundraising was, in fact, inappropriate under GoFundMe's terms or Canadian law.

#### Finding 2:

- Location: Late segment
- Quote: "GoFundMe does make money per transaction so for this type of fundraising Arrangement where we have many many small individual payments GoFundMe has made a you know a chunk of change from that"
- Technique: Vague expert / unidentified commentator
- Problem: This speaker is not identified by name, affiliation, or expertise. The phrase "you know a chunk of change" is colloquial and imprecise. It is unclear whether this person is a financial analyst, a legal expert, a journalist, or an advocate. The lack of identification prevents viewers from assessing credibility or conflicts of interest.

#### Finding 3:

- Location: Throughout
- Technique: Absence of independent expert
- Problem: No independent expert — economist, constitutional lawyer, political scientist, or protest-rights scholar — is included. All voices are either directly affected parties (resident, protester) or institutional actors with clear interests (city official, unnamed commentator). This is a significant gap in expert selection for a segment making financial and ethical claims.



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Definition: The diversity, independence, and potential conflicts of interest of all sources cited in the broadcast.

### Finding 1:

- Technique: All institutional sources have anti-protest interests
- Problem: The city official, the unnamed financial commentator, and the federal government representative all have institutional interests in characterizing the protest negatively (cost to city, ethical concerns about fundraising, federal political opposition). No source with institutional credibility and a neutral or supportive stance toward the protest is included.

### Finding 2:

- Location: GoFundMe discussion
- Quote: "GoFundMe has not yet responded to cbc's requests for a comment tonight"
- Technique: Non-response notation without follow-up
- Problem: GoFundMe's non-response is noted, which is appropriate. However, no independent platform-policy expert or digital fundraising specialist is included to provide context on GoFundMe's terms of service, the legality of the campaign, or precedents for similar fundraising. The absence of GoFundMe's voice is filled not by neutral expertise but by the city official's characterization of the fundraising as "completely inappropriate."

### Finding 3:

- Technique: Unnamed sources throughout
- Problem: Three of the four interviewees are unnamed. The Ottawa resident, the city official/politician, and the financial commentator are all unidentified. This prevents viewers from assessing their credibility, affiliations, or potential conflicts of interest — a significant departure from standard journalistic practice for a segment making serious financial and ethical claims.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION							7/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Definition: The proportion of speaking time and narrative space allocated to different positions and perspectives.

Approximate speaking time allocation (estimated from transcript):

Voice	Estimated Words	Orientation
Reporter narration	~130 words	Anti-protest framing
Ottawa resident	~40 words	Anti-protest
City official	~55 words	Anti-protest
Financial commentator	~45 words	Anti-protest (GoFundMe critique)
Protester	~35 words	Pro-protest
Federal government	~20 words	Neutral/supportive of city

**Finding: The protester receives approximately 35 words — the least of any identified speaker — and is the only voice representing the protest's perspective. Anti-protest voices collectively receive approximately 270 words of direct speech plus the entirety of the reporter's narration. This represents roughly an 8:1 ratio of anti-protest to pro-protest speaking time, which is not consistent with balanced journalism on a contested political issue.**



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Relevant facts, context, or perspectives that are absent and whose inclusion would materially alter the audience's understanding.

##### Finding 1:

- Location: Entire segment
- Technique: Omission of protest rationale
- Problem: The segment never explains what the protesters are protesting. The vaccine mandate for cross-border truckers — the stated cause — is entirely absent. A viewer with no prior knowledge would not understand why thousands of people drove to Ottawa and parked their trucks. This omission structurally delegitimizes the protest by rendering it motiveless.

##### Finding 2:

- Location: GoFundMe discussion
- Technique: Omission of donor perspective
- Problem: The segment notes that \$9.7 million was raised from individual donors but does not include any donor voice or perspective. The donors — many of them ordinary Canadians — are implicitly characterized as funding "Havoc" without any representation of their stated motivations (supporting truckers, opposing mandates, expressing political dissent).

##### Finding 3:

- Location: Cost discussion
- Quote: "the federal government says that the city of Ottawa can tap into nearly 3 million dollars in annual funding"
- Technique: Buried mitigating information
- Problem: The federal funding relief — which significantly mitigates the \$1M/day cost narrative — is mentioned only in the final sentence and is not explored. The segment does not ask whether this funding is sufficient, whether it has conditions, or whether it changes the financial picture materially. The cost narrative is built up over the entire segment and then only minimally qualified at the very end.

#### Missing Voices

1. Trucking industry representatives — to contextualize the vaccine mandate's actual operational impact on cross-border truckers
2. Civil liberties lawyers / Charter scholars — to address the legal right to protest and limits of municipal authority
3. Independent municipal finance experts — to verify or contextualize the \$1M/day figure
4. Ottawa business owners supportive of or neutral toward the protest — to balance the resident-harm narrative
5. GoFundMe legal or policy representatives — beyond a non-response notation
6. Federal Conservative opposition politicians — who were publicly supportive of the convoy's stated grievances
7. Sociologists or political scientists — to contextualize the protest within broader anti-mandate sentiment
8. Racialized community organizations — to provide structured, representative commentary on the harassment claims rather than a single unnamed resident



## 5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Complete figures include: absolute value, proportion (%) and trend

Definition: The selective, misleading, or decontextualized use of numbers to shape perception.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Opening
- Quote: "costing the city more than a million dollars a day"
- Technique: Decontextualized cost figure
- Problem: The \$1M/day figure is presented without: (a) a source citation, (b) a breakdown of what costs are included, (c) comparison to costs of other major events (e.g., Canada Day celebrations, major sporting events, state visits), or (d) clarification of whether these are incremental costs or include baseline policing. Without this context, the figure cannot be independently assessed.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Mid-segment
- Quote: "more than 9.7 million dollars raised through American company GoFundMe"
- Technique: Large number without context
- Problem: The \$9.7M figure is presented to imply the protest is well-resourced and therefore less sympathetic. No context is provided about how many donors contributed (which would indicate breadth of public support), what the average donation was, or how this compares to fundraising for other political causes or protests.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Closing
- Quote: "the city of Ottawa can tap into nearly 3 million dollars in annual funding"
- Technique: Mitigating figure buried and unexplored
- Problem: The \$3M annual funding figure is mentioned without analysis. If the protest costs \$1M/day, \$3M in annual funding covers only three days. This arithmetic — which would reinforce the cost narrative — is not performed for the viewer. Alternatively, if the \$3M is supplemental to other resources, that context is also absent. The figure is mentioned but not analyzed.



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting a position or group by associating it with extreme, discredited, or unpopular elements without establishing a direct connection.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Resident interview
- Quote: "having racial slurs lobbed at them when they leave the house to go get groceries or being called Traders by the protesters"
- Technique: Association of entire protest movement with racist behavior
- Problem: The behavior of some individuals (alleged racial slurs) is attributed to "the protesters" as a collective. No distinction is made between the protest movement as a whole and individuals who may have engaged in harassment. This associates the entire convoy with racist conduct without evidence that such behavior was systemic or endorsed by organizers.

### Finding 2:

- Location: GoFundMe discussion
- Quote: "My Hope Is that GoFundMe understands that this is a completely inappropriate use of dollars to be coming into a city to create this kind of Havoc"
- Technique: Financial delegitimization by association
- Problem: The fundraising — a legal activity — is associated with "Havoc" and characterized as "completely inappropriate," implying that donating to the convoy was itself an act of civic harm. This delegitimizes not just the protest but the hundreds of thousands of individual donors.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Framing throughout
- Technique: American association
- Problem: The segment specifically notes that GoFundMe is an "American company" — a detail that is technically accurate but editorially selective. Emphasizing the American origin of the fundraising platform subtly associates the protest with foreign interference or American political influence, a framing that was common in anti-convoy political rhetoric at the time.



## 7. TIMING & PLACEMENT

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The strategic positioning of information within the broadcast — what leads, what is buried, what precedes or follows what.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Opening sequence
- Technique: Harm-first sequencing
- Problem: The segment opens with gridlock, residents fleeing homes, and racial slurs before any other information is provided. This establishes an emotional frame of harm and victimhood that colors all subsequent information. The protester's perspective — the only counter-voice — appears near the end, after the negative frame is fully established.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Racial slur allegation placement
- Technique: Early emotional anchor
- Problem: The racial slur allegation appears in the first third of the segment, immediately after the physical disruption description. Placing this allegation early — before any financial or legal analysis — maximizes its emotional impact and anchors the protest in a moral frame of racism before the substantive reporting begins.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Final sentence
- Quote: "the federal government says that the city of Ottawa can tap into nearly 3 million dollars in annual funding"
- Technique: Mitigating information buried at close
- Problem: The only piece of information that partially mitigates the financial crisis narrative is placed in the final sentence, after the emotional and financial case against the protest has been fully constructed. This placement minimizes its impact on audience perception.



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Outrage = bias. Selective outrage amplifies the finding. Score = outrage level (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)*

Definition: Moral outrage expressed toward certain positions or actors while equivalent conduct by others is accepted or ignored.

### Finding 1:

- Location: GoFundMe discussion
- Quote: "My Hope Is that GoFundMe understands that this is a completely inappropriate use of dollars"
- Technique: Selective moral framing of fundraising
- Problem: The segment treats the convoy's fundraising as ethically problematic without any comparative reference to other political fundraising campaigns, protest funding mechanisms, or advocacy organization financing. The implicit standard — that raising money for a protest that disrupts a city is "completely inappropriate" — is not applied consistently to other forms of political fundraising.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Cost discussion
- Technique: Asymmetric accountability
- Problem: The segment holds protesters financially accountable for the city's costs but does not ask whether the city or federal government bears any responsibility for the escalation of costs through their own policy choices (e.g., decisions about when and how to enforce bylaws, whether to negotiate with organizers, or whether earlier intervention could have reduced costs).

### Finding 3:

- Location: Racial slur allegation
- Technique: Unverified allegation treated as established fact
- Problem: The allegation of racial slurs generates implicit moral outrage but is presented as hearsay without verification. No equivalent moral scrutiny is applied to characterizations of protesters as a whole — for example, the "traitors" allegation is presented as protesters calling residents traitors, but the reverse — residents or officials characterizing protesters in derogatory terms — is not examined.



9. COMPLETENESS							7/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Share of covered perspectives*

*Inverted: original value measures coverage (higher = better). Shown as deviation (higher = larger gaps).*

- | #  | Perspective  | Status                                   |
|----|--|--|
| 1  | Ottawa residents negatively impacted (noise, access, harassment)         | COVERED                                  |
| 2  | Protest organizers / demonstrators defending their actions and funding   | COVERED (briefly, one quote)             |
| 3  | City of Ottawa government (financial/administrative impact)              | COVERED                                  |
| 4  | GoFundMe (platform's position and response)                              | MENTIONED (noted as non-responsive)      |
| 5  | Federal government position on funding relief                            | MENTIONED (one sentence, end of segment) |
| 6  | Truckers / working-class participants explaining mandate grievances      | OMITTED                                  |
| 7  | Civil liberties / Charter rights perspective on protest rights           | OMITTED                                  |
| 8  | Independent financial or legal experts on municipal liability            | OMITTED                                  |
| 9  | Ottawa business owners (both harmed and supportive)                      | OMITTED                                  |
| 10 | Public health experts contextualizing the mandate policy being protested | OMITTED                                  |

**Completeness Score: 3/10**

The broadcast covers the financial cost narrative and resident grievance perspective thoroughly but omits the substantive policy grievances motivating the protest, independent legal or financial analysis, business community voices, civil liberties perspectives, and any meaningful engagement with the truckers' stated rationale.



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How the topic is fundamentally constructed — what assumptions are treated as given, what the "problem" is defined as, and whose perspective anchors the narrative.

#### Finding 1:

- Location: Opening lines
- Quote: "ottawa's downtown still in gridlock... forcing some residents to flee their homes"
- Technique: Crisis framing / victimhood anchoring
- Problem: The segment opens exclusively from the perspective of disruption and harm. The protest is immediately framed as a crisis imposed on innocent residents, with no acknowledgment of the protesters' own framing of their presence as a legitimate democratic exercise. This anchors the entire segment in an adversarial frame before any evidence is presented.

#### Finding 2:

- Location: Mid-segment
- Quote: "while the city's budget is being drained the demonstrations fundraiser is flush with cash"
- Technique: Contrast framing / moral juxtaposition
- Problem: The juxtaposition of a "drained" public budget against a "flush" private fundraiser implies financial irresponsibility or exploitation by protesters, without exploring whether the fundraising was a legitimate response to anticipated costs or whether comparable protest movements have used similar mechanisms.

#### Finding 3:

- Location: Throughout
- Quote: "ottawa's downtown remains in lockdown negatively impacting life for thousands"
- Technique: Totalizing harm framing
- Problem: The word "lockdown" — a term with strong COVID-era negative connotations — is applied to describe the protest's effect, not a government health order. This frames the protesters as themselves imposing a "lockdown," inverting the protesters' own narrative that they were opposing lockdowns. This is a significant framing choice that goes unexamined.



## 11. WORD CHOICE & TERMINOLOGY

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The use of loaded, connotative, euphemistic, or dysphemistic language that shapes audience perception beyond neutral description.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Opening
- Quote: "main roads looking more like protesters backyards"
- Technique: Dysphemism / dehumanizing imagery
- Problem: Describing public roads as protesters' "backyards" implies slovenliness, territorial overreach, and disrespect for public space. This is an editorial characterization, not a neutral description, and it is presented without attribution — meaning it is the reporter's own framing.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Mid-segment
- Quote: "create this kind of Havoc"
- Technique: Loaded language (attributed but uncontested)
- Problem: The word "Havoc" is used by an interviewee but is not challenged or contextualized by the reporter. In a balanced segment, such charged characterizations would be balanced by the opposing characterization (e.g., the protesters' description of their presence as peaceful and lawful).

### Finding 3:

- Location: Closing
- Quote: "ottawa's downtown remains in lockdown"
- Technique: Semantic appropriation
- Problem: As noted under Framing, "lockdown" is a politically charged term in the COVID context. Applying it to describe the effect of a protest against lockdowns is a significant editorial choice that inverts the protesters' own political vocabulary and implicitly delegitimizes their position.



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOR

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Asymmetries in how the reporter or anchor treats different speakers — follow-up questions, challenges, sympathy signals, or framing of introductions.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Resident interview
- Quote: "some of my neighbors are reporting experiences of having racial slurs lobbed at them"
- Technique: Unchallenged amplification of serious allegation
- Problem: The allegation of racial slurs is serious and newsworthy, but it is presented as hearsay ("some of my neighbors are reporting") without any verification, police report reference, or follow-up. In a balanced segment, such allegations would be either verified or clearly labeled as unverified. The reporter does not challenge or contextualize this claim.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Protester interview
- Quote: "everywhere we are parked is where the police have put us"
- Technique: Isolated protester voice without follow-up
- Problem: The protester's claim — that police directed their parking locations — is a significant factual assertion that, if true, would substantially alter the narrative of protesters "taking over" the city. This claim receives no follow-up, no verification, and no response from police or city officials. It is included but effectively neutralized by its isolation.

### Finding 3:

- Location: City official interview
- Quote: "it shouldn't be up to Ottawa property taxpayers to pay"
- Technique: Sympathetic framing without challenge
- Problem: The city official's position is presented sympathetically and without challenge. No follow-up question addresses whether the city has legal authority to sue GoFundMe, whether such a lawsuit would succeed, or whether the city has taken any steps to end the protest through legal means available to it.



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Whether harder, more confrontational questions are directed at one side while softer, more sympathetic questions are directed at the other.

Note: This is a pre-recorded package, so direct questioning is not visible. However, the questions implied by the responses reveal asymmetry.

#### Finding 1:

- Protester response: "this was money that was raised to help us cover the cost... we are using that money to supply for fuel"
- Implied question: Defensive — the protester appears to be justifying the use of funds, suggesting a challenging question was posed.

#### Finding 2:

- City official response: "My Hope Is that GoFundMe understands that this is a completely inappropriate use of dollars"
- Implied question: Sympathetic — the official is given space to editorialize without apparent challenge to the legal basis or proportionality of the claim.

#### Finding 3:

- Technique: The protester is implicitly asked to justify financial conduct; the city official is implicitly asked to express concern. This asymmetry — accountability questions for protesters, platform questions for officials — reflects a structural bias in interview construction.



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial or misleading balance that misrepresents the actual state of evidence, expert consensus, or public opinion.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Protester quote
- Quote: "this was money that was raised to help us cover the cost because nobody cares about the cost everywhere we are parked is where the police have put us"
- Technique: Token balance
- Problem: The single protester quote functions as a token gesture toward balance in an otherwise one-sided segment. The quote is not followed up, not challenged, and not given equivalent narrative weight to the anti-protest voices. This creates the appearance of balance without its substance.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Throughout
- Technique: Absence of genuine false balance (inverse problem)
- Problem: Unlike some broadcasts that create false balance by treating fringe views as equivalent to consensus, this segment's problem is the inverse: it presents a contested political situation as having a clear moral valence (protest = harm) without acknowledging the genuine public debate about the legitimacy of the protest's grievances.

Note: This criterion scores lower than others because the segment does not attempt to create false equivalence — its bias operates through omission and framing rather than artificial balance.



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What is established as "the issue" — what questions are asked, what debates are opened, and what is excluded from discussion entirely.

### Finding 1:

- Technique: Financial cost as primary frame
- Problem: The segment defines the protest primarily as a financial and logistical problem for the city of Ottawa. The political, constitutional, and public health dimensions of the protest — the actual substance of the national debate — are entirely absent. By making cost "the issue," the segment sidesteps the harder questions about the legitimacy of the mandate being protested and the government's response.

### Finding 2:

- Technique: GoFundMe ethics as secondary frame
- Problem: The segment's secondary agenda is the ethical propriety of the GoFundMe campaign. This framing positions the protest's funding as suspect without examining the broader question of whether political fundraising for protest movements is legitimate democratic activity. The agenda implicitly treats the fundraising as a problem to be solved rather than a form of political expression to be understood.

### Finding 3:

- Technique: Complete exclusion of policy debate
- Problem: The vaccine mandate for cross-border truckers — the stated cause of the protest — is never mentioned. The Emergencies Act debate, the constitutional questions about protest rights, the public health evidence for or against the mandate, and the political debate between parties are all entirely absent. The segment's agenda is narrowly municipal and financial, which systematically excludes the national political debate that made this protest historically significant.



## CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### A) Summary Table: 15 Criteria

#	Criterion	Score	Key Finding
1	Framing	7/10	Protest framed exclusively as crisis/disruption; "lockdown" language inverts protesters' own vocabulary
2	Word Choice	7/10	"Backyards," "Havoc," "lockdown" — loaded language consistently disadvantages protest
3	Expert Selection	6/10	No independent experts; all voices are institutional actors with anti-protest interests
4	Selective Omission	8/10	Protest rationale entirely absent; donor perspective omitted; mitigating federal funding buried
5	Moderation Behavior	6/10	Unverified allegations amplified; protester's significant factual claim receives no follow-up
6	Time Distribution	7/10	Approximately 8:1 ratio of anti-protest to pro-protest speaking time
7	Question Asymmetry	5/10	Protester appears to face accountability questions; officials receive platform questions
8	Guilt by Association	6/10	Entire protest associated with racial slur behavior; "American" GoFundMe implies foreign interference
9	Numerical Manipulation	6/10	\$1M/day figure lacks source and context; \$9.7M lacks donor count; \$3M relief unexplored
10	Timing & Placement	6/10	Harm-first sequencing; racial slur allegation as early emotional anchor; mitigating info buried
12	Source Selection	7/10	All named/unnamed sources have anti-protest institutional interests; three of four sources unnamed
13	Selective Outrage	6/10	Fundraising treated as ethically suspect without comparative standard; asymmetric accountability
14	False Balance	4/10	Token protester quote creates appearance without substance of balance
15	Agenda-Setting	8/10	Policy debate entirely excluded; protest reduced to municipal cost problem

### B) Overall Scores

- Criteria Score (average of 15):  $(7+7+6+8+6+7+5+6+6+6+5+7+6+4+8) \div 15 = 94 \div 15 = 6.3$

### C) Top 3 Manipulation Techniques Observed

#### 1. Agenda Exclusion (Omission of Protest Rationale)

The most consequential manipulation in this segment is the complete omission of what the protest is about. By never mentioning the vaccine mandate for truckers, the segment renders the protest motiveless and therefore irrational. A viewer with no prior knowledge would understand only that thousands of people have descended on Ottawa to cause



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

disruption and cost the city money — not that they are engaged in a political dispute about a specific federal policy. This is the most structurally significant bias in the segment because it operates invisibly: viewers do not know what they are not being told.

## 2. Harm-First Emotional Sequencing

The segment is constructed to maximize emotional impact against the protest before any analytical content is presented. The sequence — gridlock → residents fleeing → racial slurs → financial cost → ethical concerns about fundraising → token protester quote → federal relief — is designed to build a cumulative case against the protest before the only counter-voice appears. By the time the protester speaks, the audience has already been primed with images of disruption, allegations of racism, and financial harm. This sequencing technique is a well-documented method of shaping audience judgment before evidence is fully presented.

## 3. Institutional Voice Monopoly

Every authoritative voice in the segment — the city official, the unnamed financial commentator, the federal government — shares an institutional interest in characterizing the protest negatively. The only non-institutional voice on the anti-protest side is the Ottawa resident, whose claims are presented without verification. The only pro-protest voice is a single unnamed demonstrator whose most significant factual claim (that police directed parking locations) receives no follow-up. This creates a structural asymmetry in which institutional authority is entirely aligned against the protest, while the protest's perspective is represented only by an unverified individual voice.

## D) 3 Core Messages Embedded in the Broadcast

Content Message (what the viewer learns):

*"The Freedom Convoy protest is an expensive, disruptive, and ethically problematic occupation of Ottawa that is harming residents, draining public funds, and raising questions about the propriety of its fundraising."*

- Technique: Agenda-setting through omission + harm-first sequencing
- Evidence: The entire segment is structured around cost (\$1M/day), disruption (gridlock, residents fleeing), harm (racial slurs), and financial ethics (GoFundMe critique). No information about the protest's stated purpose, the policy being contested, or the protesters' own characterization of their conduct is provided.

Personal Message (who is presented positively/negatively):

*"Ottawa residents and city officials are sympathetic victims of an unreasonable and potentially racist protest movement funded by questionable means; protesters are disruptive, financially irresponsible, and associated with racial harassment."*

- Technique: Guilt by association + selective amplification of victim voices
- Evidence: Residents are given space to describe harassment; officials are given space to express moral concern; the protester is given a brief defensive quote. The racial slur allegation — unverified — is placed early and associated with "the protesters" collectively.

Societal Message (what worldview is reinforced):

*"Political protest that disrupts urban life and challenges government policy is a civic harm rather than a democratic right; the appropriate response is financial accountability and legal action, not political engagement with the protesters' grievances."*

- Technique: Framing + agenda-setting
- Evidence: The segment's entire analytical framework is financial and logistical (cost, disruption, fundraising ethics). The political and constitutional dimensions of the protest — the right to demonstrate, the legitimacy of the grievance, the government's policy choices — are entirely absent. The implicit message is that the protest is a problem to be managed, not a political expression to be understood.

## E) Classification

Classification: CLEAR ONE-SIDEDNESS (4.1–6.0)

**President:** Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:kontakt@SVFAB.ch) - **Address:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zurich 1



**Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung**  
**Association suisse pour une information équilibrée**  
**Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato**

This segment exhibits clear and systematic one-sidedness through structural omission, asymmetric voice allocation, harm-first sequencing, and the complete exclusion of the protest's political rationale. The bias is not primarily achieved through overt editorializing but through the more sophisticated techniques of agenda-setting and selective omission, which are harder for audiences to detect and therefore more consequential for public understanding.

## **F) Summary**

---

This CBC News segment on the Freedom Convoy's financial impact on Ottawa exhibits clear one-sidedness that falls short of the standards established in CBC's Journalistic Standards and Practices, which require accuracy, fairness, balance, and impartiality in the coverage of controversial public issues. The most significant failure is the complete omission of the protest's stated rationale — the federal vaccine mandate for cross-border truckers — which renders the protest motiveless and structurally delegitimizes it without engaging its substance. The segment's voice allocation (approximately 8:1 anti-protest to pro-protest speaking time), its harm-first emotional sequencing, and its reliance on unnamed institutional sources with aligned anti-protest interests collectively produce a narrative that functions as advocacy for the city's position rather than independent journalism. Under Section 3(1)(l) of the Broadcasting Act, the CBC is mandated to provide a reasonable opportunity for the public to be exposed to the expression of differing views on matters of public concern — a standard this segment does not meet, given that the central political controversy motivating the protest is entirely absent from the broadcast. While individual elements of the segment reflect legitimate journalism (noting the city's costs, including a protester voice, flagging GoFundMe's non-response), the cumulative effect of the editorial choices made — in sequencing, word choice, source selection, and agenda-setting — produces a broadcast that a reasonable viewer would experience as one-sided on a matter of significant national political controversy.



## CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Party Bias Scores

Party	Score (-5 to +5)	Evidence
NDP	0	Not mentioned or implicated; no discernible effect
Green Party (GPC)	0	Not mentioned or implicated; no discernible effect
Liberal Party (LPC)	+2	The segment's framing aligns with the Liberal government's characterization of the convoy as disruptive and its fundraising as problematic. The federal government's offer of \$3M in relief is presented neutrally and without criticism, implicitly validating the Liberal government's response.
Bloc Québécois (BQ)	0	Not mentioned or implicated; no discernible effect
Conservative Party (CPC)	-2	The Conservative Party was publicly supportive of the convoy's stated grievances during this period, with several MPs expressing sympathy. The segment's framing — which characterizes the protest as disruptive, costly, and associated with racial harassment — implicitly disadvantages the CPC's political position without naming the party.
People's Party (PPC)	-3	The PPC was the most explicitly supportive federal party of the convoy. The segment's characterization of the protest as causing "Havoc," associated with racial slurs, and funded through "completely inappropriate" means most directly disadvantages the political position most closely associated with the PPC.

### Evidence Detail

#### Liberal Party (+2):

- "the federal government says that the city of Ottawa can tap into nearly 3 million dollars in annual funding"
- The Liberal federal government's response is presented as a constructive solution without any critical examination of whether the response was adequate, timely, or politically motivated. The government is implicitly positioned as the responsible actor addressing a crisis caused by others.

#### Conservative Party (-2):

- The segment's framing of the convoy as a civic harm — costing \$1M/day, forcing residents to flee, associated with racial slurs — directly contradicts the CPC's public positioning during this period, in which several Conservative MPs and the party leadership expressed sympathy for the truckers' grievances. The segment does not include any Conservative political voice, effectively silencing the official opposition's perspective on a major national political event.

#### People's Party (-3):

- "create this kind of Havoc" / "completely inappropriate use of dollars"
- The PPC under Maxime Bernier was the most vocal federal party in support of the convoy. The segment's moral framing of the protest as causing "Havoc" through "inappropriate" fundraising most directly delegitimizes the political position the PPC occupied. The association of the protest with racial slurs further damages the political brand most closely associated with the convoy.

### Summary Statistics



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

- Most favored party: Liberal Party (LPC) | Score: +2
- Most disadvantaged party: People's Party (PPC) | Score: -3
- Average absolute deviation from 0:  $(0+0+2+0+2+3) \div 6 = 1.17$



## CHAPTER 4 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION

### A) CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices (JSP)

---

#### ACCURACY

- Standard: Facts must be presented correctly and verifiable.
- Finding 1: The \$1M/day cost figure is presented without source citation or methodology.
- "costing the city more than a million dollars a day"
- Violation: The figure is unattributed. Viewers cannot assess its accuracy or basis.
- Severity: Moderate
- Finding 2: The racial slur allegation is presented as hearsay without verification.
- "some of my neighbors are reporting experiences of having racial slurs lobbed at them"
- Violation: Unverified secondhand allegation presented without qualification as to its evidentiary status.
- Severity: Moderate

#### FAIRNESS

- Standard: All relevant sides of a controversy must be heard.
- Finding: The protest's stated rationale (vaccine mandate opposition) is entirely absent; the only pro-protest voice receives minimal time and no follow-up.
- Violation: The segment does not provide a fair hearing to the protest movement's perspective on the substance of its grievance.
- Severity: Significant

#### BALANCE

- Standard: Coverage of controversial issues must reflect a balance of perspectives.
- Finding: Approximately 8:1 ratio of anti-protest to pro-protest speaking time; all institutional voices aligned against the protest.
- Violation: The segment is structurally imbalanced in voice allocation and narrative framing.
- Severity: Significant

#### IMPARTIALITY

- Standard: Reporters must not take sides on controversial issues.
- Finding: Reporter's narration uses loaded language ("backyards," "lockdown," "flush with cash") that consistently frames the protest negatively.
- "main roads looking more like protesters backyards"
- Violation: Editorial language in reporter narration reflects a non-neutral stance.
- Severity: Moderate

#### INDEPENDENCE

- Standard: No signs of external influence on editorial decisions.
- Finding: No direct evidence of external influence; however, the alignment of the segment's framing with the Liberal government's public position on the convoy warrants notation.
- Severity: Minor (insufficient evidence for stronger finding)

### B) Broadcasting Act, S.C. 1991, c. 11, Section 3(1)

---

#### Section 3(1)(l) — Reasonable opportunity for differing views:

- The segment does not provide a reasonable opportunity for the expression of differing views on the convoy protest. The protest's political rationale is entirely absent, and the only pro-protest voice receives minimal time without follow-up.



- Severity: Significant

Section 3(1)(d)(i) — Safeguarding the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada:

- By omitting the substantive policy debate motivating the protest, the segment fails to contribute to informed public understanding of a major national political controversy, which is a core function of public broadcasting in a democratic society.
- Severity: Moderate

Section 3(1)(m)(iv) — Reflecting Canada's diversity:

- The segment includes a resident's account of racial harassment but does not include structured representation from racialized communities or other diverse perspectives on the protest. The diversity representation is limited and instrumentalized (used to frame the protest negatively rather than to genuinely reflect community perspectives).
- Severity: Minor

### C) CRTC Conditions of Licence

The CRTC requires CBC to maintain a high standard of journalistic ethics, including balance and fairness in the coverage of controversial public issues. This segment's systematic omission of the protest's political rationale, its asymmetric voice allocation, and its use of loaded language in reporter narration collectively represent a departure from the high standard of journalistic ethics required under CBC's conditions of licence. The segment would benefit from the inclusion of the protest's stated grievances, independent expert analysis of the financial claims, and a more equitable allocation of speaking time.

### Overall Regulatory Assessment

This broadcast segment falls short of CBC's Journalistic Standards and Practices in the areas of fairness, balance, and impartiality, and does not fully satisfy the Broadcasting Act's Section 3(1)(l) requirement to provide a reasonable opportunity for the expression of differing views on matters of public concern. The most significant regulatory concern is the complete omission of the protest's stated political rationale, which structurally prevents viewers from forming an informed judgment about the controversy being reported. While the segment does not rise to the level of deliberate propaganda, the cumulative effect of its editorial choices — in framing, word choice, voice allocation, and agenda-setting — produces coverage that functions as advocacy for one side of a contested national political debate, which is inconsistent with CBC's public broadcasting mandate and its obligations under the Broadcasting Act and CRTC conditions of licence.

### Source Credibility Assessment

Source	Funding/Affiliation	Conflict of Interest	Credibility	Counter-Voice Offered?
Ottawa resident (unnamed)	Unknown; private citizen	Direct personal interest in protest outcome	Low-Medium (unverified claims, unnamed)	No
City official/politician (unnamed)	City of Ottawa (public institution)	Direct institutional interest in characterizing protest as costly and illegitimate	Medium (institutional credibility, but clear interest)	No
Financial/ethics commentator (unnamed)	Unknown	Unknown; cannot assess without identification	Low (unnamed, unaffiliated, colloquial language)	No
Protester/demonstrator (unnamed)	Unknown; protest participant	Direct personal interest in defending protest	Low-Medium (unnamed, single voice)	No — their key factual claim (police directed parking) receives no follow-up



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

GoFundMe (non-responsive)	Private US corporation	Commercial interest in platform reputation	N/A (non-responsive)	No independent platform expert offered as substitute
Federal government (unnamed)	Government of Canada	Direct political interest in managing protest narrative	Medium (institutional credibility, but clear political interest)	No

Overall source credibility assessment: The segment relies entirely on unnamed or institutionally interested sources. No independent expert — financial, legal, political, or academic — is included. The absence of named, credentialed, independent sources is the most significant credibility gap in the broadcast and represents a departure from standard journalistic practice for a segment making financial and ethical claims of national significance.

*End of Analysis Report — Version 1.0-cbc*

*Prepared by: Senior Media Accountability Review*

*Broadcast: CBC The National, estimated February 2, 2022*



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	EXPERT SELECTION	6	●●●
2	SOURCE SELECTION	7	●●●●
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	7	●●●●
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	8	●●●●
5	NUMERICAL MANIPULATION	6	●●●
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	6	●●●
7	TIMING & PLACEMENT	6	●●●
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	6	●●●
9	COMPLETENESS	7	●●●●
10	FRAMING	7	●●●●
11	WORD CHOICE & TERMINOLOGY	7	●●●●
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOR	6	●●●
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	5	●●●
14	FALSE BALANCE	4	●●
15	AGENDA-SETTING	8	●●●●

#### HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

**6.6/10**

*Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation*

#### SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

**6.2/10**

*Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**6.4/10**

*Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation*

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## KEY — Score Definitions

### Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

<b>0</b>	<b>No finding</b>	No relevant anomaly detected.
<b>1–2</b>	<b>Weak finding</b>	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
<b>3–4</b>	<b>Slight to moderate finding</b>	Recognizable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
<b>5</b>	<b>Moderate finding with impact</b>	Relevant imbalance affecting the audience's opinion-forming potential.
<b>6</b>	<b>Significant finding (threshold)</b>	Scores of 6 and above are classified as 'significant findings.'
<b>7</b>	<b>Significant finding</b>	Clear, well-documented imbalance with distinct impact relevance.
<b>8–9</b>	<b>Severe finding</b>	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
<b>10</b>	<b>Maximum severity</b>	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

### Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

<b>0.0 – 2.5</b>	<b>Unremarkable</b>	No significant patterns detected; broadcast meets the impartiality standard.
<b>2.6 – 4.0</b>	<b>Slight imbalance</b>	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but within tolerance range.
<b>4.1 – 6.0</b>	<b>Significant imbalance</b>	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of perspective diversity.
<b>6.1 – 8.0</b>	<b>Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation</b>	Pronounced, cross-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
<b>8.1 – 10</b>	<b>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high bias degree</b>	Maximum severity across nearly all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

### Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Slightly disadvantaged</b>	Recognizable but minor disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No detectable favoritism or disadvantage.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Slightly favored</b>	Recognizable but minor favoritism.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly favored</b>	Party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.

### Legal and Methodological Notes



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

**No factual determination**

The results presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams, or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardized operationalization, not a finding of individual responsibility.

**No legal judgment**

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 3(1)(l). The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular CRTC).

**No proof of causation**

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news environment, political controversy, or format logic.

**No judgment of intent**

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means a significant imbalance was detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motives or strategic objectives.

**Heuristic comparison tool**

The index serves comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not sharp legal qualification.



## APPENDIX: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

### Legal Basis Canada — CBC/Radio-Canada

---

#### Law

---

Broadcasting Act (S.C. 1991, c. 11)

#### Relevant Sections

---

- Section 3(1)(d): The Canadian broadcasting system should safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada.
- Section 3(1)(l): The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as the national public broadcaster, should provide radio and television services incorporating a wide range of programming that informs, enlightens and entertains; be predominantly and distinctively Canadian; reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences; actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural expression; be in English and in French; contribute to shared national consciousness and identity.
- Section 3(1)(m): The programming provided by the Corporation should be made available throughout Canada by the most appropriate and efficient means.

#### CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices (JSP)

---

6 Core Principles:

1. **Accuracy:** Facts correct and verified
2. **Fairness:** Fair treatment of all parties
3. **Balance:** Balanced representation of controversial topics
4. **Impartiality:** Impartial reporting
5. **Integrity:** Journalistic integrity
6. **Independence:** Editorial independence

#### Online Legislation

---

- C-11 (Online Streaming Act): Streaming regulation
- C-18 (Online News Act): News compensation

#### Regulatory Authority

---

- CRTC (Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission): Regulation, licensing
- CBC Ombudsman: Internal complaints body (not independent, no sanctioning authority)

#### Special Note

---

Canada has no independent external regulator comparable to Switzerland's UBI. The CBC Ombudsman is an internal body. CBC left the CBSC (Canadian Broadcast Standards Council) in 2009.

#### Complaints Process

---

1. CBC Ombudsman (internal)
2. CRTC (licensing conditions)



## APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

### References

---

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (2024). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methodenbericht v4.1: Zählbare Kriterien und Multi-Modell-Kreuzvalidierung*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

### SVFAB Working Papers

---

- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Systematic AI-Assisted Analysis of Public Broadcaster Impartiality: A Scalable Methodological Framework for Measuring Structural Bias in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6688478](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Measuring Editorial Noise: A Retrospective Suppression Index for Public Broadcasting Content Analysis. [SSRN 6733280](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Source Traffic Light: A Six-Dimensional Credibility Framework for Systematic Source Assessment in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6733880](#)

*David Schläpfer — ORCID: 0009-0000-5671-9266*



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

## Reports and Membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you will find detailed reports and can also commission custom analyses for any broadcast (billed separately). To ensure the quality of our work, we depend on membership fees and donations.

### Contact and further information:

[www.SVFAB.ch](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:Kontakt@SVFAB.ch)

**Bank details:** PostFinance – POFICHBE

**IBAN:** CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

**Beneficiary:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via [www.svfab.ch](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch)



**Unbalanced Reporting** is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: Manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. Then 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. Additionally, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques – fostering not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**.

Also available as an **audiobook**.



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage – and someone else has written the script.

Those who don't know this deliver material. Good quotes that get cut wrong. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolbox – for everyone who faces a microphone and wants to know what to do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three principles of sovereignty – anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what matters after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers – for everyone who is in the public eye and wants to understand how the game works. So they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and when difficulties arise



**You think you see the world.** In Wirklichkeit siehst du den Rahmen, den jemand um sie gelegt hat. Framing ist die älteste und eleganteste Manipulationstechnik der world. Sie verändert nicht die Fakten – sie verändert, was wir aus den Fakten machen. Wie wir fühlen. Was wir glauben. Wie wir entscheiden. Und sie funktioniert – weil wir alle mitmachen. Täglich. Unbewusst. Auch du. Dieses Buch ist kein trockenes Lehrbuch. Es ist ein Übungsbuch – spielerisch, direkt, voller Beispiele aus dem echten Leben. Du lernst nicht nur, wie andere dich framen. Du lernst, wie du selbst framest – und wie du es bewusst und fair einsetzen kannst.

Because whoever understands framing sees the world more clearly. Hears news differently. Conducts conversations more confidently. And no longer so easily accepts a frame chosen by someone else.



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life – and the occasional smile.

**Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.**



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year – compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can file a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the UBI, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

But: It is not independent. It has no sanctioning power. And it decides in 99.6% of all cases: nothing.

This analysis exposes the system – factual, precise, without polemics. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional review showing: the UBI system meets none of the three fundamental criteria – it is not proportionate, not separated by powers, not market-based.

The authority supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it should be overseeing.

Essential reading for anyone considering a complaint – and for anyone who wants to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still pending.